

RFP #670 Responses to Vendor Questions

1. Can companies from outside the USA apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)

Response: No.

2. Do we need to come over there for meetings?

Response: No.

3. Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)

Response: No.

4. Can we submit the proposals via email?

Response: No.

5. Section 3.12 states that the total cost of services may not exceed a maximum allowable contract value determined by DSS. Respondents cannot guarantee a proposed solution without understanding what DSS' maximum allowable value is for this 3 year contract. Can the State please provide this information?

Response: This is standard language. DSS has not set a maximum allowable value for this contract. We will be reviewing all proposed solutions.

6. Attachment A, section 9 states that, among other things, the source code shall belong to and is the property of the State. This implies that the state is looking to procure not only the asset verification services, but also to procure ownership of the vendor's proprietary web-based case management system. Vendors who have proven, pre-developed, "off-the-shelf" systems (as requested by the RFP) which are currently in use in other states cannot transfer ownership of the source code to the State because it would prevent the sale of the use of such a system in other states. Will the State consider striking "source code" from this section and/or adding additional provisions to ensure millions of dollars are not unnecessarily required to be added to a vendor's cost proposal? To protect the State's interests while ensuring the reasonability of the State's cost for procuring asset verification services, we would recommend that the State require the selected respondent to either (1) put the source code and other IP in escrow for the benefit of the State in the event the selected respondent goes bankrupt or is otherwise unable to continue performing the services, and/or (2) require that the selected respondent provide the State with a non-transferable license to use the software subject to reasonable, standard license conditions. Barring this exception to the

terms in the RFP, most or all experienced asset verification services firms will be unable to competitively bid on this project.

Response: We will modify this language to strike "source code" as the State is looking to procure a service with this contract.

7. Is the State willing to allow the vendor to host the system/service provided they comply with all hosting and information security requirements?

Response: Yes.

8. Does the State prefer to pass requests to the selected vendor via real-time XML connectivity or through SFTP file transfer?

Response: The State does not have a preference.

9. Does the State's current Medicaid application include language authorizing the State to access applicant data and/or information, such as bank accounts?

Response: Yes.

10. Please identify the Medicaid programs subject to resource-based eligibility determinations and the approximate enrollment figures for each program.

Response: This requirement is for the aged, blind and disabled populations including the following populations with approx. 10,000 eligible for May 2016 including the following groups: Nursing Facility, HCBS Waivers, SSI Related Groups, and Intermediate Care Facilities.